


SECRET



22 FEB 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Conversation with Secretary of Defense,  
21 February 1980

25X1

1. The Secretary raised the question of the untransfer of the nuclear monitoring items from the Defense program to the NFIP. He is reluctant to go through the working out of an MOU. I told him no, that we needed some indication of our right to access to this data. He agreed to send us a note from him. I said that was all right.

25X1

2. We had a long talk about NIE 11-3/8 and the "net assessment" aspects of it. The Secretary is not willing to give the SAGA study his endorsement. There is also a similar but different PA&E study. He thinks they are both reasonable but both have assumptions that are questionable.

Originally, he suggested we leave out our quasi-dynamic analysis and the SAGA dynamic analysis. I described to him what we have now done in terms of putting both of them in and comparing them. His objection to that is he doesn't want it to appear that the SAGA analysis has his endorsement.

We left it that he and his people would review what we have just done in terms of laying out the three forms of making a comparison of the SAGA and NIE materials. He did very definitely state that in his view our quasi-dynamic analysis of the last two years is not a net assessment and he indicated that we had clearly not pretended that it was one. I believe, based on that, that we should be ready, as an alternative, just to delete everything concerning the SAGA analysis and leave the NIE as an update to last year's with a quasi-dynamic analysis only.

25X1


SECRET

SECRET

I urgently need what I have requested from Howie Stoertz in terms of the reasons that our analysis and the SAGA analysis do not agree on the one conclusion. If we could explicate, as a result of that comparison, which assumptions led to this variance in conclusion, it might be quite illuminating. It's just the kind of reason that it's worth doing several different forms of analysis. (Advance copy of this paragraph passed to NIO/SP.) [redacted]

25X1

25X1



5X1

4. I discussed the deputy to [redacted]. They have withdrawn [redacted]. They have an Air Force brigadier named [redacted] and they've ordered the Navy to come up with another nomination. I made my own suggestion and we discussed it at some length. They indicate they will look at it and come back to me. [redacted]

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1


25X1

25X1


25X1

25X1

25X1



25X1



25X1

STANSFIELD TURNER  
Director

SECRET

SECRET

AGENDA  
for  
21 February 1980 Meeting with SECDEF/DEPSECDEF

Following your Memoranda for the Record of the last (28 January) meeting are tabs with topics for discussion this week.

TAB

SUBJECT

25X1

[redacted] Award Presentation *done*

A *covered*

General Items

25X1

B *not covered*

[redacted] (This is still an active item per DDO.)

25X1

C *not covered*

[redacted]

25X1

D *not covered*

[redacted] and DIA Building. [redacted] requests that you not bring up these two items; material provided only in the event the Secretary raises the subjects.)

25X1

25X6

E *not covered*  
*drop.*

[redacted]  
[redacted] - (SECDEF was provided copy at his request.) No action required. FYI only.

25X6

Additional items covered (see MemCons)

- o Untransfer nuc. monitoring item to NFIP
- o NIE 11-3/8 & "net assessment"

SECRET

Approved For Release 2004/07/08 : CIA-RDP81B00401R002300070002-1

STAT

Approved For Release 2004/07/08 : CIA-RDP81B00401R002300070002-1